



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

even when the outcome is as piecemeal and meaningless and barren of beauty as Mr. Russell's method makes it, if we recognize that organisms seriously thirst after experience in general. There is another kind of value in the world besides truth, and beauty, and the good, and that is life itself. And no one will deny that metaphysics, even of the new unsoulful kind, is a very strenuous form of life.

MAX EASTMAN.

NEW YORK CITY.

REVIEWS AND ABSTRACTS OF LITERATURE

A Budget of Paradoxes. AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN. Edited by D. E. SMITH. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. Pp. viii + 402, 382.

Modern science has been built up by slow and laborious processes, and to achieve even a moderate understanding of it requires more labor than the great majority of the literate are willing to exert. This prepares the ground for the brood of impatient romantic souls that are eager to substitute some brilliant scheme of their own for the monotonous régime of established science. In the end these seekers after the philosopher's stone, social and physical panaceas, and other romantic get-rich-quick schemes are eliminated by their own natural sterility. But in spite of this sterility they are an interesting brood and their natural history is worthy of serious study. Such a study might contribute greatly to the understanding of the sociology, psychology, or pathology of the intellectual life. So far as I know no such study or special investigation has ever been undertaken. De Morgan's *Budget of Paradoxes*, however, is a wonderful source- or case-book for such a study. It does not go into the etiology of the subject, but supplies us with a rich museum of intellectual oddities. But one may read and enjoy these two volumes quite apart from any technical scientific interest. De Morgan was one of those rare minds that can combine a wealth of accurate learning with originality of insight and genuine wit, and the reading of these volumes is bound to evoke a feeling of gratitude to the editor and publisher for making the book more available to the general public.

The bulk of these two volumes is devoted to the mathematical heretics, the squarers of the circle, trisectors of the angle, and subvertors of the Newtonian theory of gravitation. But there is a great deal of good sense about science generally. Especially worthy of mention are the remarks on the snobbery of men of science (*à propos* of the F.R.S. and other expensive titles, pp. 25 and 30), the merciless showing-up of the myth about induction and about Bacon as the

founder of modern scientific method (I., pp. 75-79), and the answer to the theologian's appeal that the probabilities of science should not be used to attack the certainties (!) of theology (I., p. 316).

The following may give those unfamiliar with this book a taste of the style: "I look upon all the churches as fair game which declare [*cf.* the Athanasian Creed] that *absque dubio in æternum peribo*: not for their presumption towards God, but for their personal insolence towards myself. I find that their sectaries stare when I say this. Why, they do not speak of you in *particular*! . . . But I hold with the schoolmen that '*omnis homo est animal*' in conjunction with '*sortes est homo*,' amounts to '*sortes est animal*.' . . . If this be not conceded, then I retort in their own manner, 'Whosoever would serve God, before all things he must not pronounce God's decision upon his neighbor. Which decision, except every one leave to God himself, without doubt he is a bigoted noodle' " (II., pp. 32-33).

For an analysis of the differences between the logic of Protestant and that of Papal Christianity, I know nothing in all literature comparable to De Morgan's parable of the two milk dealers (II., pp. 33-36). The conclusion is still applicable in this day of friendly alliance between philosophy and theology: "The theologian writes a philosophy which seems to tell us that the New Testament is a system of psychology; and the philosopher writes a Christianity which is utterly unintelligible as to the question whether the Resurrection be a fact or a transcendental allegory. What between the theologian who assents to the Athanasian denunciation in what seems the sense of no denunciation, and the philosopher who parades a Christianity which looks like no revelation, there is a maze which threatens to have the only possible clue in the theory that everything is something else, and nothing is anything at all" (II., p. 36).

The editor has industriously ransacked the printed encyclopedias for biographical facts concerning the diverse worthies mentioned by De Morgan. But some readers would have been more grateful to him if he had been able to discover the name of the logician, friend of De Morgan, who addressed the latter thus: "Next to the man who forms the taste of the nation, the greatest genius is the man who corrupts it. I mean, therefore, no disrespect, when I say that I have hitherto always considered you as a great logical heresiarch." It may, however, be too much to expect that the reading of these volumes might induce some to become familiar with De Morgan's acute and fertile logical "heresies" embodied in his *Formal Logic* and in his memoirs in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*—of which no mention is made anywhere in these two volumes.

MORRIS R. COHEN.